

**My Role in the Students' Charges of Racism**

**Samuel Madras  
Dean of Science**

On April 30th, 1968, a group of eight West Indian students visited me in my office with Mr. K. Frederick as their spokesman. He had arranged the meeting with me a few days earlier, but did not wish to tell me what it was about. I was rather curious at first, but soon my curiosity gave way to shock when he started off by saying "Do you know, Dean Madras, that there is racism at this University in the Biology Department".

As he spoke, he was joined by other members of the group in the same vein. Their grievances were a mixture of academic and racist complaints. I wrote down the specific points they were making, and then read my paper to the students. They agreed that it contained the essence of their concerns. The charges with a racist slant were as follows.

West Indian students do not receive grades higher than C in examinations and lab reports.

The second quarterly exam held in February, 1968 was fixed in a prejudicial way.

Professor Anderson was on first names with some white students, but referred to black students as Mr followed by their last name.

The remainder of the complaints were academic, and pedagogical; some referred to the operation of the laboratory.

A copy of my paper is appended. It was not signed by any of the students when they came to this meeting. In keeping with a policy I had adopted to permit a student to inform me of whatever grievance he might wish without giving me his name for fear of reprisal, I did not take the names of these students nor ask them to sign my document.

At the end of the meeting, I told the students I would inform them of the next step in a few days.

I telephoned Dr. C.F. MacLeod, Chairman of the Biology Department, about this matter immediately. He came to my office, and we went over the paper. We were both greatly perplexed by this enigmatic development. He asked if he might take the paper with him to make appropriate inquiries. I consented to this and he took the document with him.

Despite the pressure on faculty at that time of the year to mark examination papers, to submit their grades, and to attend to the many other items of business associated with the closing of the school year, Professors MacLeod and Anderson looked into each of the students' complaints and obtained the information with which to discuss the grievances. A control sample of newly-marked final examination papers was retrieved from Professor Anderson and submitted for re-marking by Professor F. Abbott.

When we felt that the questions raised had been investigated sufficiently, we decided to convene a meeting



with the students. This meeting took place on Sunday, May 6th, 1968 at 2 P.M. Thus within five days of receiving the complaints (actually only three business days) we met to talk things over with the students. It is therefore a matter of record that those of us who were contacted at this stage responded as quickly as we possibly could. I trust this dispels an idea that the university did nothing about the matter for a long time.

I was chairman of the meeting and Miss Joan Richardson of the Dean of Students' Office was secretary. In attendance were the students, Mr. Magnus Flynn, Dean of Students, Dr. MacLeod and Professor Anderson. The meeting was informal, as had been the previous one in my office. No meeting to investigate racism had ever been held before at Sir George, or at any Canadian university, to my knowledge. No charge of racism had ever been made. There were no precedents to go by. Therefore, the procedure at the meeting was simply to carry on in the tradition of free and open discussion. Any question was permitted. No points of order were called. No one walked out of the meeting in protest, or made any other gesture of disapproval of the procedure, or the trend of discussion.

The meeting was opened up by a brief statement from me stating that the purpose of the meeting was to explore the grievances of the students, and that the procedure was simply to have the students voice their grievances and charges, or ask questions.

The issues raised were the matter of first names, examinations, remarks on exam papers, course content, complaints about absenteeism of the instructor and a consensus of what should be done.

My account of the meeting is appended. The official minutes were taken by Miss Joan Richardson of the Office of the Dean of Students. She reported to me that they were sent to the Vice-Principal, but apparently they were lost in the mail. My record is written with abbreviations, and includes my reactions to the proceedings.

It is apparent from a reading of this record how professor's remarks written on examination papers, misunderstanding about examinations, impatience with laboratory procedures and disagreement about the content of a physiology course all played their part in producing the situation between Professor Anderson and the students. The item entered in my report as "Mr. Goodin's account and its explanation" is a case in point. Mr. Goodin charged that Professor Anderson meddled in his personal financial affairs since he, Professor Anderson, "made it his business to find out how much Mr. Goodin owes the university in fees". The explanation of this matter was that one day the Accounts' Office called Professor Anderson to ask Mr. Goodin to contact them. Mr. Goodin had not informed them of his new address and his mail from the Accounts' Office was being returned unopened and unforwarded. When Professor Anderson notified Mr. Goodin that the Accounts' Office would like him



to call, this was taken as meddling.

At least four important points emerged from that meeting:

1. The racist complaint which was uppermost in Mr. Frederick's mind when he opened the meeting of April 30th in my office was shown to have no substance whatever.
2. There were areas of academic weakness that needed to be strengthened.
3. The students had concurred unanimously that they did not want Professor Anderson to be dismissed, but that he should be given assistance by senior members of the faculty.
4. These conclusions had been worked out freely by the participants of that meeting, and were not being handed down by some external jury or committee.

With these thoughts in mind, I took a little time to consider what needed to be reported about the issue. The University year had been over for about a month now; the student body had left. The faculty was busy grading examinations. The university was preparing for convocation and the summer term. Racism was never an issue at Sir George in the past, and the investigative work from April 30th to May 5th as well as the meeting of that day, proved it did not exist then either. If by racism one understands a malevolent distinction between races with the object of

exploitation, humiliation and degradation of people of another race, creed or color.

And yet, there were academic weaknesses which needed to be rectified.

In view of the above I decided to initiate remedial measures in the Biology Department. I invited Professors MacLeod and Anderson to meetings on this issue and steps were taken to ensure improvement for the fall term, as was promised at the meeting.

It was my hope that in the fall, I would meet with the remaining students since several of them had graduated that very spring, and that the measures taken to improve matters in the Biology Department would be seen to have borne fruit. Such an approach, it seemed to me was more in keeping with the constructive spirit in which everything else had been done so far in this affair. The only memorandum, therefore, was a short one addressed to university and Biology Department officers summing up my impressions of the May meetings and the events around it. A copy of this letter is appended.

In the fall, things went well in the Biology Department. There were no incidents and no complaints. Nevertheless, whenever I met Mr. Frederick in the student cafeteria, I would ask him if he would like to have a talk with me about matters in the Biology Department. He refused



my invitation consistently. His reply was usually "I will come to see you when I am good and ready", or some variation thereof. He would speak abruptly and walk away quickly. I sensed that he had undergone a great change since the spring. I later learned from Dr. MacLeod that he was absent from class during the preparations for and the meetings of the Black Writers' Conference held at McGill in the fall. I did not meet up with any of the others, some of whom had graduated.

Mr. Fiederick visited me for the first time on Tuesday, December 3rd to solicit a donation for the defense fund on behalf of a black brother arrested in Halifax. I contributed a donation, and, again, I tried to strike up a conversation, but was unsuccessful except for the same retort, only this time it was, "we will soon be ready".

Finally, he came on Thursday, December 5th. His manner was arrogant to the highest degree, and he shouted for most of the visit, which lasted about one hour. Nor did he lower his voice for the obscenities.

I was apprehensive of his manner, but, for a moment, I felt greatly relieved when he said, "you invited me, so here I am. How would you answer number 1 on this paper". It turned out to be April's Physiology exam. I invited him to sit down to discuss the question. He refused.



I proceeded to answer his question standing up. Suddenly, he tore the paper from my hand, and shouted that he was through taking s.t. from me and any other white man around here. He was here to demand that I get rid of Professor Anderson.

I asked, why, has he done something to you recently?

He shouted that that does not matter, that he does not expect a white man to understand him. "But just get rid of Professor Anderson or else."

I told him that this was out of the question. I referred to what had been concluded at the May meeting, and his statement that nothing happened recently bore out that things had improved. He retorted that Canada is a racist society and this is a racist university and that it was time this was exposed, and that if I don't get rid of Professor Anderson immediately, he would go to the Principal.

I said that it was a matter of profound importance to interrupt teaching at the University, that professors are not dismissed abruptly without just cause.

Finally, he shouted that it was useless talking to me, he was going to see the Principal.

Mr. Frederick left my office around 1 P.M., was joined by other black students and went on to the Principal's office. Since this account relates essentially what I have

seen at first hand, I will not attempt to describe what took place in the course of the afternoon, first in the office of Principal Rae in the Norris building and later in the office of Dr. MacLeod in the Hall building. I was busy that afternoon with a committee meeting which lasted till 5 P.M. When I returned to my office at that hour, I found that Principal Rae, Vice-Principal Clarke and one or two other colleagues were present. They informed me that the black students were in Dr. MacLeod's office in the floor above where apparently they had been most of the afternoon, and that the executive committee of S.G.W.A.U.T. had been trying rather unsuccessfully to negotiate with them. I remained in my office with the others until class time at 6:15, and during this interval nothing happened. I left at 6:15 for my class which lasted until 8:15. When I returned then, I was informed that the "deadlock" had been broken by two black professors, Davis and Bayne, who came to some terms with the black students on behalf of S.G.W.A.U.T. and the administration.

I was informed by the Vice-Principal that the following points had been agreed upon:

1. That a committee of five faculty members, consisting of Professors Adamson (Chairman), Menon, Marsden, Bayne and Davis, a selection agreeable to both parties, be designated as a Hearing Committee.
2. That Professor Anderson voluntarily stay away from class until the entire matter is cleared up.



3. That Science Faculty Council meet tomorrow morning (Friday, December 7th) to ratify this arrangement.

I convened Science Faculty Council accordingly. At its meeting next day, there was considerable opposition by Council to the proposed procedure. Council pointed out that if procedures are to become formal, the first formality must be the presentation of written charges. Only after that should one set up a Hearing Committee. This was at variance with what was being done. The Hearing Committee was already chosen, Professor Anderson is off classes, but the plaintiffs had not presented charges.

To answer this criticism, the Principal and Vice-Principal emphasized that this was an emergency, and that charges would be presented very soon. Finally, Science Faculty Council voted for the recommended procedure with Dr. Verschingel casting the only dissenting vote. The minutes of this meeting are appended.

During the weekend that followed we expected the charges to be submitted any hour. But this did not happen.

On the Tuesday of the following week (December 10th, 1968), while three biology students, Michael Star, George Foldes and Donna Oldrich, were in my office to inquire about their cancelled classes, Mr. Frederick walked in to ask if I knew where he could find Professor Campbell. I did not. He turned to go, and I asked him if he was

preparing the charges the committee was waiting for. "You can go to hell" he replied, and proceeded to walk out. I asked him to repeat. He did this more deliberately and more loudly. Later I learned that he had requested from Dr. Campbell permission to write a special mid-term examination that week, before the regularly scheduled exams to be held during the following week of December 16th so that he might return to Granada for a three week Christmas holiday. Apparently he was looking for Dr. Campbell to inform him that he was not going to write the special examination after all.

I reported this incident to a meeting of the department chairman of the Faculty of Science held on Wednesday afternoon December 11th. The chairman urged that another emergency meeting of Science Faculty Council should be held to ratify a letter to the Vice-Principal expressing our concerns. The working paper for that letter is appended.

There was some question about the feasibility of holding a meeting at this time. A petition signed by seven members of Council was presented to me making it mandatory for me to convene this meeting. It was suggested that it be held on the next day, Thursday, December 12th in the hope that it might generate the necessary information against the departure of Mr. Frederick for Granada, so that he shall assist in the drawing up of charges, and participate in a hearing, to be held over the Christmas holiday if need be.



If the programme of a university department can be thwarted, surely it is not too much to ask that those who are the alleged victims of the persecution give up their holiday so that due process might be followed to redress their wrongs. Such were the hopes of the group who petitioned the convening of Science Faculty Council.

The end of the working day was approaching, and I asked my secretary to invite members of Science Faculty Council to another emergency meeting to be held the following day.

The next morning, I was notified as I came to the office that numerous telephone inquiries had been made already as to whether or not this was going to be an open meeting. Feeling that the interest was so great that it would not be possible to hold a closed meeting even if we wanted to, I advised the secretary that she may say the meeting will be open.

The meeting was heavily attended with a large part of the audience standing. I opened the meeting by announcing the rules for holding the meeting, that the audience may listen only. I then read the minutes of the meeting of December 7th. Toward the end of this, Mr. Frederick interrupted by shouting obscenities. I ordered him out and a slight scuffle occurred between us. Then another black, Mr. Roosevelt Douglas, shouted a point of order that white students were invited to this meeting

but black students were not. I answered him by saying that no special invitations were extended to anyone, and that no machinery exists for inviting white students first, then black students, or day students, then evening students.

In the meantime, the meeting had become intolerably noisy, and a motion was presented and passed to adjourn the meeting.

The adjournment of the meeting of the Science Faculty Council under these conditions appeared to underline the advice that this was not the time for meetings, but rather for a cooling off period. This feeling was reinforced by the departure of Mr. Frederick for Granada and the approaching Christmas holiday.

On Friday, December 13th, a meeting took place between Vice-Principal Clarke and a number of black students, and attended by the lawyer of the university, Mr. David Schwartz to discuss the matter of charges, to which I was not asked. The black students informed the Vice-Principal that I wrote a document in my office during their visit, and this document contained the essence of their charges. If this document were produced, it could serve as the basis for their charges. Furthermore, they stated that when I finished writing this document, they signed it. A letter from acting Principal Clarke arising from this meeting asked me if I would forward to him this signed document for this purpose.



I was rather surprised at this development. A lot of fuss had been kicked up about racism, a university wide committee had been set up, a meeting of Science Faculty Council had been booked in, the Principal had resigned, and all for the purpose of going over exactly the same charges as had been investigated once already. One would think that there would be many new ones, but apparently there were not any! The old ones were all that could be produced, and then by myself, not by the alleged victims of the racism! Nevertheless, if they want it that way, so be it. Dr. MacLeod returned the document to me, I xeroxed it to keep a copy for myself, and sent the original to Principal Clarke. On receipt of this document, he informed me that it was unacceptable because it was not signed. I replied that there was no signed document of this nature. Principal Clarke met with the black students again, and from this meeting came a tentative agreement that either Dean Madras produce by January 3rd, 1969 the document he wrote and the students signed in his office last April, or else the black students will draw up their own set of charges by January 11th. I was not invited to this meeting but I was simply advised of this agreement.

Not wishing to hold things up in any way, on December 20th, I wrote two letters to Principal Clarke. In one I explained that there could not have been any such signed document because I do not ask students to identify themselves or to sign their notes of complaint. On the other

118

I say simply that I do not have such a document because there is no such document.

This correspondence is appended. .

At a meeting held on January 6th, I learned that the black students were in the process of drawing up their own charges. Presumably, the document I forwarded was not going to be used because it was unsigned.

The time-table now was that the black students will present their charges against Professor Anderson by January 11th, that Professor Anderson will be given a week after January 11th to prepare his defence.

On January 11th, the black students filed their charge - they accused Professor Anderson of racism. No specific charges were mentioned.

The difficulties of judging this kind of charge are apparent at once. How can anyone prove or disprove the charge?

Others can tell better than I what happened during the period from January 6th to January 26th since I was not invited to any negotiations with the black students any more. The hearing took longer to prepare than anticipated.

Finally it was scheduled for Sunday, January 26th. But on Wednesday, January 22nd the two black professors on the committee, Professors Davis and Bayne, resigned. The



black students now declared the Hearing Committee null and void, and wanted a new one according to "the spirit of December 5th". The university declared it would go ahead with the January 26th hearing by replacing the two black professors if need be. A whole new dimension was thus added to the dispute. The black students declared the university's Committee illegitimate.

The hearing was held on January 26th, with about 1000 students and faculty in attendance directly in the hall, or watching the proceedings over closed circuit T.V. The black students, organized now into a large movement, distributed a leaflet stating their claim that the hearing was unacceptable because the committee was constituted against the conditions allegedly agreed upon on December 5th, and that therefore they would boycott it. Nevertheless, they entered the hall, took their places as one of the parties to the hearing, with Professor Anderson and his lawyer, Mr. Lyon, as the other. They soon walked out.

The record of the meeting is written up elsewhere, and will be given best of all by the committee itself.

It is a matter of record, however, that the committee appealed to the black students to return, and when they refused the committee adjourned briefly to reconsider its right to its mandate. The committee members reaffirmed their competence to continue the hearing even though the black students had left.

Mr. Lyon, Professor Anderson's attorney, then called me as the first witness, and as his first request, asked me to recognize and to read the document of charges I had written in my office on April 30th. I complied with his request, and gave my testimony to the meeting.

This was my last direct involvement in the case.



The document written by myself on April 30th, 1968  
as the students voiced their grievances during their meeting  
with me in my office.

## "CASE OF NEGRO STUDENTS"

### Prejudice

1. No Negro student gets above "C" despite their obtaining higher grades in quarterly and mid-term.
2. Failure rate, D, lab reports are all in same trend.

### Organisation of the Lab and Lectures

1. Unethical demonstrators who urge you to copy someone else's paper.
2. Inconsistency in the marking of labs.
3. Labs not well organized. The circuits did not work. The labs were not previously prepared and not tested. Electrical signals were not obtained.
4. Two junior demonstrators are completely incompetent. They cannot answer questions nor explain anything.
5. Lecturer is not qualified. Appears in class with lectures unprepared. Answers questions so poorly as to be embarrassing. Was unable to work out buffer concentration problem. On examination, question was asked to define buffer, but the answer expected is presumably much more than a simple definition and yet no indication of precisely what that might be. Class morale suffered.
6. Examination is poorly constructed. Questions about complex concepts expected to be answered in 35 words or less. Mid-term had question for 55 marks on "Organelle", not legitimate in course in animal physiology.
7. The Mid-term was written on December 18, marks released to class on March 19. The second quarterly was written before marks for



mid-term released.

8. Textbook is too short and too simple. Does not satisfy examination answering. None of the books recommended were very appropriate. No book was assigned for the second term. The first semester was on the Cell membrane. Nervous system, etc., suffered.
9. Absenteeism - Slept in, alarm clock, no cancellation.  
15 lectures cancelled.  
6 movies. Out of time, out of context with lecture development.  
Student contact very bad.  
No appointments, breaks appointments.
10. The second quarterly (February) exam was "fixed" in a prejudicial way. Student asked to see the master sheet and was evaded.
11. On first name basis with white Canadians, on Mr. basis with Negroes.  
See Bill Greenfield re its whom you know and whom you blow."

# Case of Negro Students.

## Prejudices

1. The negro student gets along despite their obtaining higher grades in quarterly & mid term.
2. Failure rate, D, lab reports. One all in same bunch.

## Organization of the lab and lecturers

1. Unethical demonstrators who urge you to copy someone else's paper.
2. Inconsistency in the marking of labs.
3. Lab not well organized. The circuits did not work. The labs were not properly prepared and not tested.



3. Electrical signal was not obtained.

4. Two junior demonstrators are completely incompetent ~~and~~  
They cannot answer questions or explain anything.

5. Lecturer is not qualified  
Appears in class with lectures unprepared. <sup>Answered question in poor manner</sup> Was unable to work out buffer concentration problem. On examination, student was asked ~~about~~ to define buffer, but the answer expected is presumably much more than a simple definition and yet no indication of precisely what that might be. Class morale

- 5 -

Examination is fairly confidential.

Questions about complex concepts expected to be answered in 35 words or less.

Midterm had questions for 55 words on "openell" Not legitimate course in animal physiology.

7. The Midterm was written on Dec 18 marks released to class on Mar 19. The second quarter was written before marks for midterm released.

8. Text book is too short and too simple. Does not satisfy examination answering. None of the book



recommended were very appropriate

No book was assigned for the second term.

The first semester was in the Cell membrane. Nervous system etc. suffered.

9. Absenteeism - Slept on alarm clock. no cancellation

15 lectures cancelled

6 moves. Out of time, out of

contact with lecture development.

Student Contact very bad.

No appointments, breaks, appointments

- 5 -

10. The second quarterly (Feb)  
exam ~~was~~ was 'fixed'  
in a prejudicial way. ~~The~~  
Student asked to see the meter  
sheet & was ~~refused~~ <sup>excused</sup>.

11. On first names basis with  
white Canadians, on M<sup>r</sup> basis  
with negroes

See Bill Greenfield re. etc.

whom you know and with

you blow.



My personal notes of the meeting of May 5th,  
1968.

When I presented on not on

May 5-

Present: Rodney John (R.J.), Ballantyne, Brown, (B.),  
Mossop, K. Frederick (K.F.), Goodin (G.), Chow,  
Flynn, MacLeod, Anderson (And. or A.),  
Joan Richardson (Sec'y), Madras (M.)

Opening: To explore grievances of delegation of Tuesday  
Apr. 30. No special agenda. Any questions, any  
statements, no formalities.

K.F. "Sandra and Chue" for white Canadians. Mr. for West  
Indian students.

And. They worked with him. No special point.

K.F. IBM Exam of Feb. 1968: the docking for wrong answers  
was eliminated; the 10% increase of the mark was  
advantageous to white students.

And. Class did badly, and marks were adjusted.

M. IBM exams often turn out with poor absolute marks and  
need re-calibration. No sign that West Indian students  
protested their marks; only the 10% increase.

Madras (on verge of tears, nervous) resented deeply "you  
have only one way to go" written on his paper. Mark  
11/100. "What's his business to tell me this?"  
"I was sick all term".

M. such remarks improper. Never use them. Did A. do this  
only to West Indian students?

And. No, "I didn't think they would take this so badly;  
won't repeat". Did it to all students.

Allan Brown On his paper "you are capable of understanding  
all the material in this course" yet I got  
only 51/100. Frustrated terribly. Didn't



care for the course even if he got higher mark at end.

And. repeated regrets

A. added that he felt doubly sorry because he had a high regard for these students. B. was consistently good student, "good thinker". Mossop more intermittent, but also capable if he applied himself. Sorry to have hurt them. As for the marks of 11 and 61, they were carefully checked by the class standards.

M. Incidents regrettable. Facetious remarks should be avoided. Difference of opinion about marks is common between students and professors and could not be ascribed to racism in the context as I see it. A. seems genuinely sorry.

K.F. raised question whether any West Indian student ever got more than a C.

A. was prepared for this one since it had been on my paper, and he cited cases to show affirmative.

M. I reminded students of University regulation about rereads of exams.

Goodin had to be absent from an exam and A. asked him for an explanatory letter from a medical officer.

A. said that he does ask students for such letters, when C. complied, A. set him another exam.

M. Pointed out that this was University policy to ask for letters, Expressed opinion that And. was considerate in setting a special exam. He could have entered Abs.

K.F. and R.J. then spoke about this exam further 55% on "organell". Relatively little on "systems" e.g. nervous system. What is expected about "Buffers"? Poorly, even embarrassingly so, presented in class.

And. replied that he presented physiology from a cellular rather than pre-med. viewpoint. Did not agree about student complaint re chem problems, but I was not too impressed with his statement. Began to feel that there was real academic weakness.

K.F. continued to press in this vein. He dated his lectures and therefore has a complete record of 17 unexplained absences, 3 absences due to illness, 1 due to the need to repair equipment(?) and 3 lecture periods were used to show films. 2 of the absences were from scheduled tests. Sept. 22, 25, Oct. 2, 9, 20, 23, Nov. 3rd(slept in) 6(exam) 22, 24 Dec. 6, 15. Jan. 10 (equipment) 22, 26, 29 illness Feb. 7, 16, Mar. 6, 8, 13, 18, 27

Shocked at this. And. began to explain but no definite refutation achieved. Impression that Anderson had over-extended himself. Expressed my concern. Pointed out need to report absences to Asst. V.P., chairman, dean, etc., & to notify class ahead of time.

Several speakers now raised points about the labs, text books, demonstrators.

Joan Richardson said to me it is obviously academic, not racial.

Simultaneously K.F. began to make a point about the lab and mentioned the word discrimination. Allan Brown cut in to ask him to desist from the racial theme.

#### M. Goodin's account and its explanation

In summing up, Flynn and MacLeod stated the problems were academic, MacLeod asked the students whether it was their wish that Anderson should be fired. They unanimously said no to this. More communication between them, Anderson, the Biology Department and other officers of the University, Dean of Students, dean of faculty.

In my summing up, mentioned that the complaints were presented as if there were both racial and academic charges. This meeting showed that the racial charges could not be supported, but the academic ones were serious. Promised that meetings with MacLeod & And. will be held as soon as possible to plan for the fall, now that the term is over. Expressed hope that the results of these efforts to eradicate roots of complaints - i.e. strengthening the teaching, labs - would be apparent.



May 5-

Present John Ballentine Brown, Moser, Frederick Brown,  
Philp, Lyndon, Chalm, Hyman, Mark, and Joe R. (Saj) M.

Opening: To express appreciation of diligence of June. Apr. 30.  
We should express our appreciation of the students' progress.

R.E. "Sandra and Chuck" for a letter to Kane. M<sup>rs</sup> for W.I.'s

And. They worked with him. No special point  
at every end of the day. General idea of the day  
to write some.

And. Class did badly and much was expected.

M. 1800 hours. After turn out with pen and ink  
marker and read a collection. The sign that all  
students put their names. Only the 1800 hours.

Moser (on way of home) Reminded deeply "you

have only one way to go" written on his paper. You  
"What's the answer to this?" I asked all time.

M. such a man to improve. How is this. Did he do  
this only to W.I's?

And. No. I think that they would not be so badly;  
was a great. Did it to all students.

Alfred Brown On his paper "you are capable of anything  
all the content in this room" just just only "You are capable  
to write. Did it once for the same reason of the first by the  
mark at end.

And. repeated regrets

A. said that he felt strongly about because he had a  
high regard for this student. Some were really good  
students, "good thinkers" M. was not one of them, but  
he was able to explain himself. Sorry to have lost  
them. As for the marks of 4 and 6, they were  
carefully checked by the class standards.

M. Incidents regrettable. Section remarks  
should be avoided. Differences of opinion are about  
much common and could not be ascribed to  
division in the contest as I see it. A. seems  
genuinely sorry.

R.F. raised question whether any President  
ever got more than a C.

A. was prepared for this one since it had  
been in my paper and he cited cases to show otherwise.

M. I raised student ~~that~~ of U. regulation  
about records of names.

Gooden had to be absent from an exam  
and A. asked him for an explanatory  
letter from Officer.



H. said that he does ask students for such  
letters. When I replied, H. sat in silence and  
I pointed out that this was the policy of  
work for letters explained before that H. was  
convinced in other, a special exam. He could have  
entered H.

K.F. and R.S. then spoke about this exam further.  
53% on "exam" Relatively little on "system"  
of review system. What is expected about "Buffy"?

Poorly, even embarrassing, presentation in class.

Dad replied that he presented physiology from  
a cellular rather than pre-med. viewpoint.  
Did not agree about stud. complaint re exam  
problem. But I was not too impressed with his  
statement. Began to feel that there was  
real academic weakness.

K.F. continued to press in this vein. He stated he  
followed and therefore has a complete record of  
17 unexplained absences, 3 absences due to illness,  
1 due to the need to repair a pump?) and



3 lecture periods were used to show films 2 of  
the lectures were from scheduled books.

Nov 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 (Snyder) - (1944) 22, 23  
24, 25, 26, 27 (Snyder) 22, 24, 27. Others Feb 7, 16  
Mar 6, 8, 13, 18, 21.

Students at the end of the 1st lecture  
but no real participation. Students  
that students had never extended summer.

Expressed a concern. Students at the end of the  
lectures to see if P. (Snyder) (Snyder) 9 &  
not. Also want to know.

Several questions were raised about  
about the book. The book, however, is not.

from the end to the end it is a very  
reading, not much.

Unfortunately P. began to make a  
point about the end of the book. It was  
discrimination. When I began to ask  
him to assist from the needs of the.

1. Epidemic disease and its explanation.

In Sunday aft. Hys and Mee first stated the problem, were exonerated. Mee first asked the student whether there was with that audience should be paid. They unanimously voted in favor. Mee recommended to listen them, audience, the Biology Department and other people of the University. Mee of students. Mee of faculty.

In my Sunday aft. mentioned that the complete problem was that there were both recent and audience change. The society showed that the recent change could not be supported. But the audience was more serious. promised that meetings with Mee & Co. will be held as soon as possible to plan for the

full, and that the time is over  
expressed by the words of one to  
affairs of the world to which complaint  
— is everything to which some could  
be applied.



My report of the essence of the meeting of  
May 5th, 1968.

*The following are not new*

June 14th, 1968.

Respectfully to: Mr. M. Flynn,  
Dean of Students

My investigation of the charges and the grievances brought by a group of students against Professor P. Anderson consisted of talks with Mr. Anderson, Dr. MacLeod and attendance of the hearing held on Sunday, May 5th, 1968.

I have come to the following conclusion.

1. I am convinced that there is no substance to the charges of discrimination and racism levelled against Mr. Anderson. Every case cited of a shanghaier is mere evaluation of an examination, or the calling of students by their last names instead of their first names, can be explained as well within the margin of general experience and encounter between professor and student, white or black.
2. The laboratory preparations is at the level to be encountered, if not expected, in an advanced science course especially in a biological discipline. Needless to say, everything will be done to improve the laboratory in the future.
3. In the same spirit, all academic weaknesses in this and other courses are a matter of grave concern to the students, the professor and the faculty and every effort will be made to improve the teaching.
4. Students are invited at all times to approach their professors and discuss and to discuss freely and constructively any of their problems.

S. Madras  
Dean  
Faculty of Science

SM:cw

c.c. Miss J. Richardson  
Dr. C.F. MacLeod  
Assistant Professor P. Anderson  
Acting Principal D.B. Clarke



The Minutes of the reorganized meeting of Science  
Faculty Council December 6th, 1968.

SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Emergency Meeting of the Council  
of the Faculty of Science

Held on Friday, December 6th, 1968

PRESENT: S. Madras, Chairman; T. Adley; A. Deland;  
M. Harrow; C.F. MacLeod; J. McBride; S. Mitchell;  
S. Morris; W. Raudorf; R. Rye; A.E. Smith;  
N.E. Smith; J. Ufford; R. Verschingel; R.C. Rae.  
Students present were M. Beer; C. Dufoinaud;  
B. Uditsky.

Principal R.C. Rae was invited to open the meeting. He outlined the events of the previous day, Thursday, December 5th. Mr. K. Fredericks had been in his office to complain verbally about alleged racism on the part of a faculty member of the Biology Department. Later on this student in the company of other Negro students visited the office of Biology Chairman C.F. MacLeod, and remained there until a group of the CAUT executive meeting nearby, persuaded them to leave. To achieve these, the group apparently promised that a committee consisting of Professors A.H. Adamson; C.S. Bayne; C. Davis; M. Marsden and P.K. Menon would be struck to study their grievances.

The purpose of the present emergency meeting of Science Faculty Council was to be informed of these events and to ratify the committee. Another development was Professor P.D. Anderson's request to be relieved of his duties, which was requested and granted by the Vice-Principal late Thursday night.

The Chairman added that Mr. Fredericks had also visited him at 11:00 a.m. on the previous day, that he spent about one hour in his office. During that time, Mr. Fredericks showed the Chairman a copy of April, 1968 Physiology exam, but did not make clear why he did so. He shouted repeatedly that "Professor Anderson must be removed or else".

As the discussion opened, a number of specific questions were asked:

Is there any written document, duly signed, to indicate the charges of the student against Professor Anderson?

What is the mandate of faculty committee?

Is the faculty committee supposed to investigate before charges are laid?

Great concern was expressed about the procedure of striking the committee before charges were laid as a retrograde anti-democratic step.

The question was asked about the rights of the faculty member in the event that the charge of racism is thrown out.

What retribution will the students of Professor Anderson's class have in the event that the disruption of classes was baseless.

It was stressed that students should be made aware that they are liable for a libel charge.

The question was asked about the rules of procedure the committee was to follow. It was pointed out that the rules of procedure were only in the stages of being formulated.

It was pointed out that the Negro students sitting in Dr. MacLeod's office had rejected the CAUT rules of procedure for conducting an inquiry against a faculty member.

The question was asked about what rules of evidence the committee was to follow in their investigation.

Concern was expressed that charges are not altered in the course of the investigation.

The point was made that the conduct of Mr. Fredericks in threatening the person of Professor Anderson, in demanding his dismissal, in creating conditions which warranted Mr. Anderson's request to be relieved of duties, in shouting obscenities at various officers of the University, called for legal and disciplinary counter-action by the University.

In the course of the above questioning, it was announced that the committee of five was in session, and that they should be invited to sit in with Science Faculty Council.

There was some doubt about the validity of doing this before the committee had worked out its rules



of procedure and evidence, and before charges were received in writing. Soon, however, the committee was invited to join Science Faculty Council, recessed until 11:30 a.m. At 11:30 a.m. Professors M. Marsden, A.H. Adamson, C. Davis, P.K. Menon and D.B. Clarke joined the reassembled Council.

The Chairman asked the Committee about written charges and rules of procedure and evidence. Vice-Principal D.B. Clarke replied that a group of three professors (unnamed) spoke to the Negro students Thursday night and decided that their charges, expressed verbally, were serious enough to warrant the setting up a Faculty Committee.

Professor Marsden added that rules of evidence and procedure will be established, and that no doubt the committee will expect to receive charges in writing. Professors Adamson and Davis agreed.

Professor Marsden then read the interim CAUT document on procedure in the event of complaint or charges against a faculty member.

Dr. MacLeod asked whether the students agreed to this document.

Professor Davis said they did after the committee had been struck.

To Dr. R. Verschlingel's question about charges, Professor Davis replied that the students voiced their charges last Spring.

The Chairman stated that charges of racism and incompetence, including absenteeism and weakness in classroom, laboratory and examination procedures had been investigated last Spring. In the course of that investigation, the charge of racism was rejected as unproved, and that the charges of academic weakness would be examined with a view to their redress should they prove to be relevant. The Chairman added that this was done, and that a report had been deposited with the Dean of Students who played an active part in the discussions. Thus, the charges laid this Spring do not carry over without their reformulation by some individual. Furthermore, there were no charges in writing even in the spring investigation.

At this point Mr. McBride stated the following:

That Science Faculty Council approve the Faculty Committee of Professors Adamson, Thellman, Bayne, Davis, Marsden and Menon with the proviso that it begin to function as an investigation committee only on receipt of charges, with specific time limit of 10 days.

Seconded by Dr. Ufford.

Dr. Verschlingel objected to the principle of the motion. Other members explained that its approval is a time saving expedient when time is so precious. Assurances were given that the committee would disband if no charges are forthcoming. Other speakers contributed their opinions about the legality of the committee, its mandate and its urgency. Dr. Morris would have preferred to have the committee restrict itself to the study of rules of procedure. This could not be accepted as a motion because another motion was on the floor.

Other members wanted Science Faculty Council to see the charges first before any committee sees them.

The Principal pointed out that the situation was serious. Professor Davis added that Professor Anderson approved of the Committee last night. Dr. Ufford asked whether the committee, as well as the students, should have a time limit imposed.

Professor Adamson stated he expected the work of the committee to be over by next Friday, December 13th. He added that the charges be deposited with the Dean. Mr. McBride asked that the legal resources of the University be at the disposal of both the students and Professor Anderson.

Finally, a vote on the motion was taken. Result 9 for, 5 against.

Dr. Verschlingel stated his protest to be recorded in the minutes. He objected strongly to the setting up of a committee, and its ratification by Science Faculty Council, prior to the deposition of charges. Recorded duly.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m. having been convened at 10:00 a.m.

The working paper to be discussed at the second emergency meeting of Science Faculty Council December 12th, 1968. This meeting was adjourned without concluding its business because of the impossibility of quiet deliberation.



December 12th, 1968.

Memorandum to: Science Faculty Council

At the Special Emergency Meeting of Science Faculty Council held on Friday, December 6th, 1968, the following resolution was passed "That Science Faculty Council approve the Faculty Committee of Professors A.H. Adamson, Chairman; C.S. Bayne; C. Davis; M. Marsden and P.K. Menon with the proviso that it begin to function as an investigating committee only on receipt of charges with a specified time limit which it will set".

The Committee received no charges from anyone, and also, set no time limit for receiving any. Nor did the Dean of Science receive notification from the accuser other than an obscenity when he asked Mr. Fredericks for such a document.

Meetings of Science Faculty members have discussed this development, especially in the light that Council members had forewarned against the fullness of danger which such a procedure holds. The fact that a member of faculty has asked to be relieved of his duties on the one hand, while, on the other, the individual student who precipitated the crisis still attends classes, and incidentally, asks for and has been granted permission to write specially set examinations to accomodate him in intention to return to the West Indies for the holiday, has shocked faculty and students alike. But, even more grave is its potent for the University. Apprehension is being felt more and more that by passing the resolution of last week in good faith, on the axiomatic assumption that charges would be laid in a few days, and an investigating committee would start its work immediately, Science Faculty Council, one of the official legislative bodies of the University, will have set a precedent whereby any individual anywhere in the University, on any pretext, can raise the cry of racism; whereupon a professor, a librarian, a cloakroom attendant, is asked to be relieved of duties while his "accusers" go free to take their time about setting down the charges.

Obviously, the problem is beyond the scope of the Biology Department or the Faculty

of Science. It is a matter for the entire University. Science Faculty members have voiced their concern that the University is not fully aware of the issues of this case. Even the letter from the Vice-Principal to the University does not cover all the menacing implications of this case: that the University can be brought to a halt on the say-so of an individual.

It is hereby recommended that a memorandum such as this one forwarded to the Vice-Principal as Chairman of University Council with a request that he take whatever action is feasible to communicate our feelings to the University as a whole.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'S. Madras', is written in a cursive style.

S. Madras  
Dean  
Faculty of Science

SM:cw

This correspondence between Acting Principal Clarke and myself on the matter of the document of charges written in my office on April 30th, 1968 requested by the students to serve as the basis of charges for the new hearing committee.



December 13, 1968:

By hand

Dean S. Madras,  
Faculty of Science,  
Sir George Williams University,  
Montreal, Que.

Dear Dean Madras:

At a meeting with a number of black students held this morning with David Schwartz and myself, the students told us that at a meeting they had held with you in your office last April, you had written down and formulated the charges that they were making against Professor Anderson, and that they then signed these charges at the time in your office. If you have this document, it shall form the basis of the hearing of the Investigating Committee, and should be produced and forwarded to me immediately. I must know not later than January 3, 1969, whether or not you are able to produce the document in question signed by those students.

Yours sincerely,

Douglass Burns Clarke  
Vice-Principal (Academic)

DEC/SV

Copy of letter sent to the following: Oliver Chow  
Mervin Phillip  
Kennedy Fredericks  
Allan Brown  
Douglas Mossop  
Terence Ballantyne  
Rodney John  
Wendell Goodin

December 16, 1968.

Dear

A meeting was held on Friday, December 13th, between Mr. David Schwartz and myself, of the university, and Messrs. Douglas Mossop, Terence Ballantyne, and Rodney John representing a number of students who wish to express their grievances against Professor Anderson. At this meeting, it was disclosed that at a meeting in Dean Madras' office last April, charges against Professor Anderson were written out by Dean Madras, and signed by eight students involved as follows:

Oliver Chow	Douglas Mossop
Mervin Phillip	Terence Ballantyne
Kennedy Fredericks	Rodney John
Allan Brown	Wendell Goodin

It was therefore agreed that Dean Madras be given a deadline of January 3, 1969, to produce these written charges, and if they are available that these charges will form the basis of the investigation of a Hearing Committee.

If these charges are not available, it was agreed and confirmed at a later meeting held on Monday, December 16th, that those students who wish to press charges would prepare new written charges by January 11, 1969. Following the receipt of these charges a period of at least one week must be provided to Professor Anderson to prepare his defence and to allow the Hearing Committee to organize its hearings.

Yours sincerely,

Douglass Burns Clarke  
Acting Principal

DBC/SV

December 17th, 1968.

Memorandum to: Principal D.B. Clarke

I have passed on to you a copy of my hand written report of the charges by the group of black students against Professor Anderson made in my office last April. I do not have any other copy with any signatures on it. The copy I have sent you is the original.

S. Madras  
Dean  
Faculty of Science

SM:cw



December 20th, 1968.

Memorandum to: Acting Principal D.B. Clarke

I have your letter of December 16th in which you ask for the document I wrote while the students were in my office.

The only document I have is the hand-written one I passed on to you. I know of no other.

S. Madras  
Dean  
Faculty of Science

SM:cv

December 20th, 1968.

Memorandum to: Acting Principal D.B. Clarke

I have your letter of December 16th in which you ask for the document I wrote while the students were in my office.

That document was hand-written by myself, and it is now in your possession. In declaring that no other signed document exists, I cite my recollection of what occurred that day.

I wrote these changes as the students spoke. I checked with them at each stage to make sure that I was writing down what they were saying. After completing the script, I read it to them, and they agreed that I had it down correctly. I then promised them I would start to work on it immediately.

The meeting then rose and nobody signed anything. The students left, and I called Dr. MacLeod promptly. After our meeting Dr. MacLeod asked if he may take the list of charges with him. I consented. I gave him the document without making a copy. He returned it to me on Wednesday, December 18th, and I sent it on to you.

S. Madras  
Dean  
Faculty of Science

SM:cv